



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,307	02/09/2001	Dieter Backer	A-2698	6701
24131	7590	07/28/2004	EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, PA P O BOX 2480 HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480				WILLIAMS, KEVIN D
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2854		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/780,307	BACKER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kevin D. Williams	2854	A

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

1. Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claim 5 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Serkh (US 6,379,275).

Serkh teaches a belt drive comprising a belt 20,26 for revolving during operation, said belt defining a longitudinal direction and a transverse direction, said belt having two protruding edges 27,28 oriented in the longitudinal direction

of said belt and being opposite one another in the transverse direction of said belt, a belt guide 41 having stops 29,30 with shaped surfaces acting on said two protruding edges of said belt, said shaped surfaces being concavely curved surfaces (col. 6, lines 27-29), where said shaped surfaces are rotationally symmetrical stop surfaces in rolling contact with said edges.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofmann (US 6,250,224).

Hofmann teaches a machine for printing images comprising a belt drive including a belt 60 for revolving during operation, said belt defining a longitudinal direction and a transverse direction, said belt having two protruding edges (Fig. 3) oriented in the longitudinal direction of said belt and being opposite one another in the transverse direction of said belt, a belt guide having stops 64 with shaped surfaces acting on said two protruding edges of said belt, where the shaped surfaces are rotationally symmetrical stop surfaces in rolling contact with said edges.

Hofmann does not teach said shaped surfaces being concavely curved surfaces.

Serkh teaches a belt guide having shaped surfaces 29,30 being concavely curved surfaces (col. 6, lines 27-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hofmann to have the shaped surfaces as taught by Serkh, in order to vary the diameter of the guide and in turn vary the amount of force and motion transferred by the belt as taught by Serkh.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New reference Serkh teaches the claimed invention.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant's attention is invited to previously cited US patent 6,440,023 which discloses a belt structure 10 comprising elements 20 which contact a belt guide surface 2.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin D. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-2172. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KDW
July 15, 2004



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800